

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENT	OR	ATTO	DRNEY DOCKET NO.
08/794,8	51 02/04,	/97 BARANY		F	19603/461(0
			$\neg$	EXA	MINER
HM12/0418 MICHAEL L GOLDMAN			PONNALURT, P		
NIXON HA	RGRAVE DEVA	ANS AND DOYLE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CLINTON P O BOX ROCHESTE				1627	36
					04/18/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## Application No.

08/794,851

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

Barany et al

**Advisory Action** 

P. Ponnaluri

1627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Thora	
reject	efore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final tion under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for
	ance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination
(RCE)	in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
	THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]
a)	The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b)	In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ex ap se	ctensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate ctension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The opportiate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally it in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. 🛭	A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>Feb 6, 2001</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. 🗆	The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. X	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a)	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
(0,	issues for appeal; and/or
(d)	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	BEST AVAILABLE COPY
. $\Box$	BES! AVAILABLE GO!
4. 🗆	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
<b>-</b> []	
5. 🗆	
~ []	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. 🛭	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) $\Box$ affidavit, b) $\Box$ exhibit, or c) $\boxtimes$ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
6. X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the
6. Q Pp lìc 7. 🗆	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a)  affidavit, b)  exhibit, or c)  request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the
ρρίι. 7. 🗆	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the first is no administrative flery in poseuring this application (see MFEP 804-18.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by since there is no administrative delay in poseuring this application (see MPEP source). The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
ρρίι. 7. 🗆	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the first is no administrative first in poseuring this application (see MFF) sources.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
ρρίι. 7. 🗆	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a)   affidavit, b)   exhibit, or c)   request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by since there is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the first is no administrative for two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claim(s) allowed: NONE
ρρίι. 7. 🗆	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by Since there is no administrative delay in proceeding this application (See MPE) sources.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claim(s) objected to: NONE  Claim(s) rejected to: NONE
ρρίὶ. 7. □ 8. ⊠	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claim(s) allowed: NONE  Claim(s) rejected: 1-43, 45-66, 75-80, 82-88, and 138-151
ppi;2, 7.□ 8.⊠ 9.□	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).  The a)   affidavit, b)   exhibit, or c)   request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Applicants arguments would not overcome the potential obviousness double patenting rejections discussed in the previous office action. There is no requirement of two-way obviousness double patenting rejection as suggested by the simple of the previous of the previous of the considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claim(s) allowed: NONE  Claim(s) objected to: NONE  Claim(s) rejected: 1-43, 45-66, 75-80, 82-88, and 138-151  The proposed drawing correction filed on